DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 164 SP 035 595

AUTHOR Vogt, Lynn Allington; Au, Kathryn H. P.
TITLE The Role of Teachers' Guided Reflection in Effecting Positive Program Change.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-10, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conceptual Tempo; *Cultural Influences; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Education; *Faculty Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; Language Acquisition; Language Arts; Literacy Education; Partnerships in Education; Program Improvement; *Reflective Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *Kamehameha Early Education Program; *Rough Rock Demonstration School AZ

ABSTRACT

Kamehameha Elementary Education Program (KEEP), in Hawaii, and Rough Rock (which serves Navajo students in Arizona) are dedicated to strengthening the school success of students who have not thrived in traditional mainstream school settings. Both programs have rooted change efforts in the belief that students would experience improved school success if a better match existed between the linguistic and cultural knowledge of the students and the school. In KEEP, teacher thinking and reflection have been encouraged, and teachers are provided with the tools and resources needed to facilitate this reflection. Three periods of KEEP's teacher training and support history include: the three-hat model (teachers assuming three roles: teacher, researcher, and consultant); the dissemination phase; and the whole literacy phase. Collaboration with Rough Rock began during the dissemination phase, to test hypotheses regarding the culturally compatible features of the KEEP program: student interaction at independent centers, comprehension-based reading instruction, and talk-story turn-taking. Teacher training, observation, feedback, and reflection were provided. Teacher reflection has been stimulated by participation in qualitative research aimed at program improvement, observation of teaching-learning interactions, frequent collaborative dialogue with consultants or mentor teachers, and journal writing. (Contains 23 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Vogt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Role of Teachers' Guided Reflection in Effecting Positive Program Change

A paper presented at the 1994 AERA conference in New Orleans,
originally titled *The Role of Training and Support in Effective Program Change*

ED 377 164

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Lynn Allington Vogt
Kathryn H. P. Au
Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate

Kamehameha Elementary Education Program (KEEP) and Rough Rock have dedicated their existence to strengthening the school success of students who have not thrived in traditional mainstream school settings. Both programs have rooted change efforts in the belief that students would experience improved school success if a better match existed between the linguistic and cultural knowledge of the students and the school. Schools, however, are like people; while they are dynamic and malleable to the impact of historical events, they have a firmly entrenched subculture of their own. This culture has been described as transnational. It is as if a DNA code produced a dominant genetic trait resulting in schools across the world that are culturally more alike than they are different. Quick change efforts, like random genetic mutation, all too often result in superficial, one-generational change that has little impact on the organism over time. Hence the evolution of significant school change requires a long-range view to result in successful adaptation. And like species in nature, where successful adaptations evolve in interaction with the environment at large, school change is a result of interaction between administration, teachers, school staff, students, community pressures and historical events.

Since teachers are the primary carriers of the school-culture gene, teacher support, development and commitment are essential elements in effecting positive school change. Environmental pressures for change must be powerful and favor something different than the status quo. Traditional pressure to change often comes from administrative mandate. Traditional methods of teacher in-service training tend to focus primarily on information dissemination and seldom create change in the day-to-day ways teachers do things. In addition, this kind of "training" tends to carry with it the genetic marker of the transnational culture of the school. Changing

SO 35595

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teachers' behavior from one of automatic transnational response to one of thoughtful, informed, and even culturally compatible response requires something more.

At each point in KEEP's development, change efforts have been guided by an overall framework that includes a philosophy of teaching and learning and a base of knowledge in research. This framework has evolved over the 23 years of KEEP's existence, moving from a behavioral orientation to whole language. One of the stable features of the framework, however, has focused on the role of the teacher. Teacher thinking and reflection has always been encouraged and time to reflect on their practice has been provided. Finally, KEEP has provided teachers with the tools and resources needed to facilitate this reflection.

In comparing project milestones at KEEP and Rough Rock, there are striking similarities in teacher development that resulted in observable positive program effects, and likewise, similarities in what did not foster positive change. As we trace the evolution of teacher training efforts at KEEP and then with KEEP's association with Rough Rock, we will emphasize these themes:

- Have an overall framework for teaching and learning
- Promote reflection
- Provide time for reflection, and
- Assist teachers with tools and resources for reflection.

KEEP

KEEP's teacher training and support history can be divided into three periods: the three-hat phase (1971 – '78,) the dissemination phase (1979 – '88) and the whole literacy phase 1989 – present.) The KEEP – Rough Rock collaboration began in 1983 at the midpoint of the dissemination phase.

From the start, the KEEP project pointed toward a program which would be developed and disseminated to a larger population of at-risk Hawaiian students. Because of this, curriculum development efforts adopted the concept of *least change.* That is, if the goal was to export findings to the state's Department of Education (DOE) public schools, where the majority of at-risk Hawaiian students attended, changes in curriculum would best be within easy reach of the means of the DOE teachers and school budgets. Classrooms were set up to emulate the teacher-student ratios, classroom organization and curriculum choices then prevalent in DOE

schools. Early program efforts were devoted to monitoring the timely delivery of a standard DOE curriculum in classrooms where the students were industrious. Likewise, the very first training and development for KEEP teachers was in managing student behavior and curriculum delivery. It is easy to see that this model for program development is likely to carry with it the gene for the transnational culture of schools, and is unlikely to produce classrooms which are culturally compatible for native or minority students. This was, in fact, the early result of KEEP's efforts. Data showed significantly higher on-task rates for KEEP students and significantly more curriculum units covered with no accompanying rise in standardized test scores.

Fortunately, since another of KEEP's goals was to develop teachers who not only could demonstrate effective teaching, but could teach it to other teachers, developmental support was not limited to this sort of classic training and monitoring. A three-hat model for teacher development pertained.

Three-hat Model

The three-hat model was so named because it described a time when teachers were asked to assume and develop three roles: teacher, researcher and consultant. With this idea in place, staff development opportunities for the teachers were unusual in their breadth and intensity. There was nearly a one-to-one ratio between teachers and research support staff at KEEP. Teachers taught half day class loads and worked in collaboration with researchers from a variety of disciplines including anthropology, psychology and linguistics. Teaching took place in a lab setting where teaching and learning could be monitored via one-way mirrored glass from an observation deck above the classrooms. What occurred was often video- or audio-taped for analysis and feedback.

Vogt will describe her own experience as a new KEEP teacher in 1975:

> From the start I was asked to set specific goals for my teaching, to design research to assess progress toward the goals and to keep a daily reflective journal which was submitted to the program director each Friday. He read the journal and worked with me and other researchers to push forward my goals and the goals of the developing program.
>
> To assist in developing consulting skills I received communication skills training that focused on reflective listening and feedback. Practicing these skills was immediate and ongoing, though most often

in the role of consultee that first year. In addition to interacting with researchers I was paired with a more experienced teacher who taught the same students I did. We worked together to coordinate classroom management policies. She modeled teaching and behavior management strategies. She took a role in monitoring and giving me feedback on my own goals and coaching me toward KEEP project goals for positive behavior management. As the year progressed I was paired with other mentor teachers to strengthen my knowledge of issues related to reading instruction and curriculum management.

In support of my developing knowledge base, I was encouraged to read current journal articles and texts. The half-day teaching load allowed time to read widely, and fostered opportunities to discuss ideas with other teachers and researchers. Interaction with new theories along with active ongoing research created a paradigm shift for me, especially with respect to the traditional roles of teachers and students.

As is often the case, many important and lasting shifts in perspective are fostered by encounters which are unpleasant at the time. One such encounter occurred with a researcher who overheard me grumbling, in typical teacherly fashion, about my second graders "just having no sense of responsibility." He responded in an acerbic tone, "If you think that, you obviously haven't read *Gallimore, Boggs and Jordan.*" Needless to say, in my chagrin I sought the text immediately and that was the catalyst that stimulated the journey that resulted in learning to let go of my transnational culture-of-the-school response to my students and the beginning of my ability to see these Hawaiian students as partners in the classroom rather than adversaries. I was soon able to tap their strengths and gained both cooperation and improved results on academic tasks.

While I sometimes perceived heavy top-down guidance, I was also encouraged to take risks, to innovate, to pursue new interests and most of all to think, to reflect and to respond objectively rather than subjectively. Along with changing my *automatic response* in times of tension with students, I learned to see with new eyes, to step outside of the situation and act with a sense of *informed response.* I developed a

sense of humor, along with the ability to forgive myself, for being human and often looking like a fool on the videotapes. Needless to say it was a time of extremely intense growth and development of my knowledge and skills for the three hats I was being groomed to wear.

The investigations of program and teacher development that had begun in 1972 resulted in significant improvement in reading scores by the spring of 1976. The three-hat model of teacher support and participation in program development continued, earning KEEP recognition from the Ford Foundation an exemplary program in 1982.

To recap, while we began with a behavioral framework, and operated from the concept of *least change*, the innovative, culturally compatible program that evolved did so in an environment that included both traditional and non-traditional training and support. In addition to expanding our knowledge base, we were provided time, tools and resources for reflection. These features, set in a climate that encouraged risk-taking, resulted in a sense of ownership in the change process and a sense of joint responsibility for the success of the program.

Dissemination Model

It was necessary to find out if the results gained in the lab school could be replicated in the public schools where most Hawaiian children are educated. Phase two began with field-testing the KEEP program in two public schools, one on O'ahu, and one on the island of Hawai'i. Both demonstrations yielded similar positive gains. From that point, dissemination pressures began to mount, and a program was begun to train teacher-consultants who would work in public schools to install KEEP in existing DOE classrooms. A primary goal was to create similar changes in teacher knowledge and behavior without the time and money expense of the three-hat model.

An intense year-long program was developed to transmit the vast and current research knowledge that KEEP teachers felt had influenced them to change under the three-hat model. This included readings and workshops intended to provide foundations in areas such as anthropology, linguistics, classroom organization and management, and criterion– and norm– referenced testing and measurement.

Developing this foundational knowledge base was the first focus of training,

so consultant trainees had no classroom teaching assignment during this phase of training. However, they observed model lessons and were required to demonstrate each teaching strategy with small groups of students. These lessons were videotaped and trainees participated in analysis and feedback sessions. They practiced consulting and listening skills, interacting over their own lessons and those of their cohort of trainees. Using simulated class data sets, they learned to group students for instruction and plan and prepare lessons to match criterion-referenced student profile sheets. And the year-long training culminated with trainees demonstrating mastery of the entire reading program for up to a semester at the lab school or Kamehameha Elementary School, which was then a demonstration site for the program.

This intense training program produced teachers with a vast new knowledge base, which included understanding of the concepts of a culturally compatible program, as well as the ability to effectively demonstrate that knowledge in teaching. For these consultant trainees, many of the elements of the three-hat model were in place and functioned to effect paradigm shifts and increase teaching skills. The framework from which they operated was one of a culturally compatible, comprehension-based reading program. However, two major differences pertained. First, while reflection was an integral part of training, it was focused primarily on attempts to master program goals. Second, there was a lack of participation in research to solve problems or further develop the program. However, a portion of the foundations stand of the training involved exposure to different research designs, and trainees would participate from time to time in research at field sites. Most certainly, the training program developed much higher levels of skill in objective observation and analysis of data than traditional educational course work offered.

While these teacher-consultants had the skills and knowledge to effect positive change in classrooms with at-risk Hawaiian students, they were not given single classrooms of their own. Instead they moved to public school dissemination sites and worked with anywhere from two to ten existing teachers, helping them to implement the KEEP program. Results at dissemination sites were as variable as are individuals. In general, success in disseminating the program was higher with motivated teachers who were eager to learn and encouraged to be reflective partners in their school change efforts. Lasting collaborations resulted when teachers

themselves became partners with KEEP consultants and/or research staff to continue to develop or change the program.

An important point to consider here is that a program based on multidisciplinary research and educational theory should be responsive to continuing research and development based on ongoing evaluation. While KEEP had a successful reading comprehension component, it soon became clear that it lacked a broader literacy scope. Pressures from national trends as well as thoughtful KEEP site participants continue to develop and shape the program.

The Whole Literacy Curriculum

In 1988, both internal and external evaluations of KEEP's test results in public schools suggested that the program was not producing the desired gains in students' overall literacy achievement. In the following years, KEEP staff members redesigned both the curriculum and the dissemination model in a effort to achieve greater gains in students' learning. In the fall of 1989, KEEP launched a new whole literacy curriculum. This curriculum maintained culturally compatible elements of instructional and peer interaction and built on the success KEEP had experienced thus far with the process approach to writing, incorporating a whole language philosophy and literature-based instruction. Students' ownership of literacy became the overarching goal of the curriculum. Instruction was to be organized in a Writers' Workshop and a Readers' Workshop. The curriculum included grade level benchmarks and a portfolio assessment system to monitor students' progress in ownership, the writing process, reading comprehension, language and vocabulary knowledge, word reading strategies, and voluntary reading.

Implementation of the whole literacy curriculum got off to a rocky start. KEEP staff members and public school teachers alike wrestled with the paradigm shift to new ways of thinking about teaching, learning and literacy. Many teachers who'd mastered elements of KEEP under the dissemination model experienced difficulty conducting the more open-ended Readers' and Writers' Workshops. In 1990-91 and 1991-92, portfolio assessment data were collected and analyzed. The results obtained in these two years were nearly identical. Promising results were obtained for three aspects of literacy: ownership, voluntary reading and word reading strategies. However, poor results were obtained for the other three aspects: the writing process, reading comprehension, and language and vocabulary knowledge. Only one-third of KEEP students were judged to be at grade level and about two thirds below grade

level in the latter aspects.

These two years of mixed results led to a change in KEEP's overall dissemination strategy in the fall of 1992. By this time, KEEP was operating in 10 public schools, working with a total of over 150 teachers and 3,200 students. Teachers within these schools differed greatly in their understanding of the whole literacy curriculum and the teaching approaches necessary for successful implementation of a Writers' or Readers' Workshop. Because of the magnitude of change required in philosophy and teaching approaches, KEEP consultants found the task of moving all teachers forward simultaneously overwhelming. When Jan Turbill and Brian Cambourne, experts on the process of change to whole language, came to consult at KEEP, they suggested the motto of "go with the goers."

"Going with the goers" became the basis for the change in dissemination strategy, which took the form of the Demonstration Classroom Project. The goal of the project was to demonstrate that the whole literacy curriculum, when fully implemented, could make a measurable difference in students' achievement. Each KEEP school site selected a focus, Readers' Workshop or Writers' Workshop, and each consultant was given the task of working collaboratively with just one exemplary teacher to implement one of these workshops along with portfolio assessment.

The 13 demonstration teachers were recruited in the spring. In the fall, they met with their consultants to determine how they would go about implementing a Writers' Workshop or a Readers' Workshop. Teachers were introduced to the newly devised Classroom Implementation Checklists for the workshops and asked to set goals for themselves according to the items on the checklists. The consultant then supported the teacher in reaching these goals.

Because the whole language philosophy lends itself to many different interpretations, items on the checklist specified the "what" but not the "how." For example, one item on the checklist asked that teachers provide opportunities for students to share their writing. The item did not state that teachers must conduct an Author's Chair, although that was the usual arrangement. Another item asked that teachers make connections between literature and the children's own writing, and again, exactly how this was accomplished was left to the teacher.

As in earlier KEEP models of teacher development, observation, feedback were tools used to stimulate teacher and consultant reflection. In some cases, this

included dialog journals between consultant and teacher. The demonstration classrooms were observed every month. The consultant then met with the teacher to discuss the observations, and the two worked out new goals to be pursued. By the end of the year, teachers in the project had achieved levels of implementation ranging from 88% to 100%. The results obtained in Spring 1993 were promising. Students in all the demonstration classrooms showed measurable improvements in achievement, when compared to the same teacher's students the previous year. Overall, approximately two-thirds of students were judged to be at or above grade level, with one-third below grade level, reversing the pattern of the previous two years.

It appeared, then, that the whole literacy curriculum could be effective when fully implemented. Building upon the foundation established in their work with the 13 teachers, in the fall of 1993 KEEP consultants increased the number of demonstration teachers to 30. The consultant's job was now conceptualized as that of working collaboratively with teachers to bring their classrooms to demonstration quality, or full implementation of the whole language curriculum.

Many consultants experienced difficulty with the new, highly focused demonstration strategy. Previously, consultants had concentrated their efforts on teachers with the greatest needs, for example, first year teachers who required assistance even with classroom management. Now they were focusing the majority of their efforts on the enthusiastic "goers." Some consultants felt they did not themselves have sufficient background in whole language to work effectively with the highly skilled teachers in the Demonstration Classroom Project. It was somewhat a reversal of roles for the former mentor to be put in a position where the teacher was as much or more of an expert. It was especially uncomfortable for a few when giving the demonstration teacher specific feedback on the results of the Classroom Implementation Checklist. It put to the test the idea of the consultant and teacher as collaborators.

For their part, the demonstration teachers experienced difficulty as well. All disliked the idea of being singled out, even in this complimentary manner. Many struggled with the demands of portfolios, fully implementing KEEP's assessment system only under duress. This school year, however, the returning demonstration teachers report having a much easier time, especially with portfolio assessment. Having been through the process once, they are now able to anticipate the work

required, and pace themselves and their students accordingly.

As hoped, teachers' knowledge of the grade level benchmarks has resulted in higher expectations for student learning. In parallel fashion, knowledge of the Classroom Implementation Checklist has led teachers to a deeper understanding of literacy learning and instruction. For example, when they entered the project, few teachers in the Writers' Workshop were sharing their own writing with their students. By the end of the year, this practice had become routine for many.

A new framework had to be put into place. Consultants and teachers had to develop an understanding of a new philosophy and knowledge base. Because the teaching approaches associated with the Readers' and Writers' Workshop were so complex and dynamic, teacher reflection became more important than ever. Teachers needed to be prepared to do everything they asked their students to do. For the first time, teachers were forced to explore their own literacy, to confront their personal strengths and weaknesses as readers and writers, and to set goals for their own literacy, in order to teach effectively. Teachers began to keep their own literacy portfolios, following a model developed by Jane Hansen. They began to share the writing in their own journals and notebooks with students. Consultants had to go through the same process of exploration and reflection.

THE KEEP – ROUGH ROCK COLLABORATION

KEEP's association with Rough Rock began in 1983, when the dissemination model of teacher and trainer/consultant development was well established in Hawai'i. KEEP's initial purpose at Rough Rock was to test hypotheses regarding the culturally compatible features of its own program: student interaction at independent centers, comprehension based reading instruction and talk-story turn-taking. Which features would transfer and which would require adaptations? The strategy was to install the KEEP program in one third grade classroom, observe its effects, and work with the Rough Rock staff regarding adaptations that appeared necessary based on the Navajo students' responses to those three aspects of the program.

The timing of our association was fortunate as Afton Sells, in whose classroom we set up KEEP, along with other members of Rough Rock's staff were seeking additions or alternatives to the basic skills reading program that they had been using. KEEP's use of reading strategies that began with students' language and experience and relied heavily on group discussion to produce or interpret text

appealed to them. So, without having initially intended it, teacher training and development with Rough Rock staff began almost immediately.

Modeling was the first training tool: modeling of program features as well as the strategy of using qualitative research inquiry to determine the course of program development and/or change.

From the second day in the classroom it became apparent that Navajo students would respond differently to KEEP's style of teaching than Hawaiian students would. We needed help from Navajo staff observing videotaped lessons, interpreting what was happening from the point of view of a Navajo child, and brainstorming ways to change the KEEP program to get the kinds of responses that would more likely promote learning. In exchange for these services teachers would be able to come and observe the program in action.

In addition, KEEP was asked to provide a series of workshops for the Rough Rock staff about the language-based comprehension strategies we used. So this added the second level of training: direct instruction. Workshops Vogt gave that year and during subsequent visits over the next five years included the following features:

- A theoretical foundation for each strategy, based on current thinking in reading education and language development;
- Simulation or demonstration of the strategy;
- Application of the principles of the strategy as teachers designed their own lesson.

Whether or not the teachers actually used the strategy was their own choice at first.

The third type of staff development experience, observation, feedback and reflection, was provided only upon teacher request during the fall of 1983. But as the grass-roots interest in Rough Rock's developing program increased and more teachers became involved, observation and feedback was routine for all teachers participating in program development efforts. Initially Vogt observed and provided feedback in conferences with teachers, but later that role was assumed by Rough Rock staff. Some videotaping and self analysis was done, but on a limited basis. At no time, however, was observation and feedback as frequent or ongoing as with KEEP program teachers.

The fourth kind of staff development opportunity was that of participating in the construction of Rough Rock's English/Navajo Language Arts Program

(RRENLAP). It began with summer work in which the teachers and aides used KEEP's criterion-referenced student objective profile sheet as a model and rewrote objectives for strands in both English and Navajo. They then developed curriculum units and tests for the objectives. In order to do this work, they had to build upon earlier education and curriculum experiences and increase their own knowledge of language and literacy development.

Rough Rock's initial plan was to install RRENLAP one year at a time, beginning with Kindergarten and focus staff and program development efforts on building a cadre of community-based teachers who would likely stay at the school. Shifts were made in grade-level assignments to accommodate this plan. In a sense, they were "going with the goers" before KEEP embraced the strategy. Key members of the Rough Rock staff visited KEEP in Hawai'i for training and observation of the KEEP program. This included teachers, aides, the principal and a member of the school board, in one– to two–week visits over a three year period of time.

By the third year of RRENLAP, Rough Rock staff was ready to respond to the same need for change that the KEEP program was addressing: To expand the oral language and reading program to include process writing and replace time spent heavily testing individual objectives with more authentic kinds of assessment, such as writing portfolios. Teachers at Rough Rock participated in process writing training that resulted in each of them writing something for a collection of personal stories, and providing models of themselves as writers for their students. At this time, they also voiced a need to decrease dependence on basal readers and use more authentic and meaningful texts, often theme-based. They had previously written tests and curriculum units to support RRENLAP objectives, but now they were poised to write texts based on Navajo cultural traditions, and to further encourage students to use such topics for their own writing.

Ownership of the program is often cited as a factor influencing significant change efforts. Rough Rock's program development began as a grass-roots effort by Navajo staff. One factor that contributed to this situation was a lack of stability at the administrative level. When KEEP first began collaboration with Rough Rock, we went through three principals in one year. The Rough Rock school board, a community-based group, responded to the teachers' encouragement to continue the KEEP/Rough Rock collaboration. The developing program there was kept alive by the teachers and aides as the revolving door to the principal's office continued to

whirl and RRENLAP was born. RRENLAP's longevity has been enhanced by the stable leadership provided by Dan Estell, the current principal who was a teacher at Rough Rock when KEEP arrived. Their current efforts are given guidance and focus by Terri McCarty, who did her doctoral dissertation work at Rough Rock, and has encouraged teachers and aides to continue their professional development as they expand the important work of creating the educational program. Recent assessment shows significant positive program effects.

One additional staff development experience for Rough Rock staff occurred when they began keeping dialogue journals that were shared at monthly meetings with Dr. McCarty. Maintaining these journals and sharing them as they groped with the concepts of authentic assessment, provided that one additional important staff development opportunity, that of ongoing self-reflection. This use of journals was present in early days at KEEP and was used again in the past three years between some KEEP consultants and teachers.

Effective and lasting program change must be rooted in quality staff development for those who will do the teaching. This is especially important in efforts to create culturally compatible educational programs for indigenous students. The transnational culture of the school must bend to accommodate the learning strengths of its students and, in the case of Rough Rock and other community-based educational efforts, the staff as well. Traditional training and staff development programs are often inadequate in stimulating the needed paradigm shifts away from the mainstream culture of schooling.

Let us digress for a moment back to the genetic metaphor of our introduction. In nature, random genetic mutation is common, but such experiments most often result in early death of the new organism. The mutant gene provides only the raw material for change; it is necessary for environmental pressures to favor that new organism and operate to stimulate a genetic line more fit for survival. And the evolution of the new species takes time. For example, in England before the industrial revolution, white moths predominated. With increasing soot pollution in the air, the white moths were easy prey for birds as they rested on darker and darker backgrounds. Genetic mutation introduced a black moth. He and his kind reproduced, and as the white moths continued to decline, environmental conditions favored the new breed of darker moth.

So it is with schools. To foster real, lasting change from transnational

operating procedures we must begin with a profoundly new idea, but then the environment must favor the reproduction of that idea while at the same time pressure the old paradigm to fade away. And there must be adequate time for this to happen.

Reflection as a change agent

KEEP and Rough Rock have taken a long-range view on support and training of their teachers. The new idea of culturally compatible programs that resulted, and continues to evolve, combines both traditional and non-traditional kinds of staff development experiences for the teachers. On the traditional side, there are activities such as workshops and exposure to current educational theory to provide information and build on the teachers' knowledge base. New knowledge sometimes stimulates teachers to forge a path not yet traveled, or at the very least to create a new and exciting lesson or two. But it is only the extremely motivated teacher who will continue on that path for any length of time without other forces operating to promote the change efforts. Without some sort of follow up or ongoing stimulation, when a teacher gets in a tough spot it is natural to revert to the fall-back position of what she knew before.

Also traditional, and an important aspect of school change efforts is program monitoring. A common form of program monitoring is that of a principal or curriculum supervisor checking a teacher's lesson or unit plans and observing to see if the plan is being carried out. This focus on the teacher carrying out a curricular plan misses the mark for stimulating the kind of change we are after at KEEP and Rough Rock. In many cases, the frequency of monitoring is limited, often boiling down to a once a year observation linked to teacher evaluation. Even with principals dedicated to frequent monitoring, this emphasis on curricular content misses the mark. For instance, at one point at Rough Rock teachers were required to submit lesson plans once a week to the principal who monitored the allocated time for each subject written on the plan. The plan was to be on the teacher's desk at all times, and if he walked into the room he expected the teacher to be teaching the lesson noted on the plan. This well-intentioned scheme, while prompting some teachers to improve their skills at writing lessons keyed to learning objectives, failed to take into account the effects of the plan on the learner. This might be viewed as a worse-case scenario, but the effect it got was typical of most program monitoring: business as usual in the classroom. Whether observation is frequent or infrequent,

this traditional kind of monitoring places too much emphasis on evaluation of the teacher delivering content, and does little or nothing to promote reflection and dialogue between observer and teacher.

Another kind of traditional program monitoring is that of relying heavily on standardized, norm-referenced test scores to assess program effectiveness. If results are not forthcoming, a new curriculum is mandated. Without going into detail we ask, *does anyone know of a case where this kind of monitoring produced thoughtful day-to-day change in a teacher's interaction with students?*

For KEEP and Rough Rock the above mentioned traditional elements are part of the equation. We operate from a framework that requires activities to improve the knowledge base of teachers, we conduct frequent and explicit program monitoring, and we evaluate program results using both standardized and alternative forms of assessment. However, the environmental pressure that mutated the gene that carries the transnational culture of the school and continues to promote quality professional development is rooted in our less–than–traditional focus on teacher reflection. Over time in both programs, there have been different means of stimulating teacher reflection. These include, but are not limited to the following:

- teacher's participation in qualitative research aimed at program development or improvement efforts;
- observation of teaching–learning interactions (live or videotaped, of one's own teaching or that of an demonstration teacher) accompanied by discussion that promotes analysis, brainstorming and problem solving,
- frequent collaborative dialogue with consultants or mentor teachers who are not assuming the role of teacher evaluator, but one of coach
- journal writing, followed by collaborative interaction over reflections.

It is important to note that all of this training for reflection is collaborative; it is not something that can be mandated as a solo activity in the hope of a quick-fix remedy. However, it has been our experience that teachers who develop the skills of a reflective practitioner through training experiences such as these, tend to fall–back on reflection, to engage these skills, when unexpected things happen in the classroom. They tend to withhold the automatic transnational response and assume

a stance of, "Hmmmm, what's going on here?" They can make informed decisions without relying on another person to stimulate their thinking. Most certainly, these kinds of staff development opportunities foster much higher levels of skill in objective observation, analysis and reflection than traditional educational course work offers.

Engaging in the kinds of professional conversations that these reflection activities promote is not automatic and is seldom easy. The way schools tend to operate, teachers spend relatively lonely professional lives behind their own closed classroom doors. Because traditional observation is associated with performance evaluation, having an observer in the classroom often creates evaluation anxiety. In the three-hat model and the consultant trainee program at KEEP, specific training in listening and consulting skills was offered. Even with these skills in place, in KEEP's work with public school teachers and at Rough Rock, it has taken time for relationships to build so that these conversations can take place. But where these elements that foster change have been set in a climate that encourages risk-taking, the result is a sense of ownership in the change process and a sense of joint responsibility for the success of the program. That, along with a long-range view of program development, provide the conditions for new, lasting paradigm shifts for teachers and hence a new kind of schooling for our students. With teacher reflection as a change agent the transnational genetic code can be replaced by a culturally compatible code.

References

Asam, Claire, et al. (1993). *Consultant Implementation Guide , Kamehameha Elementary Education Program.* Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate.

Au, Kathryn Hu-pei. (in press). Portfolio assessment: Experiences at the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program. In S.W. Valencia, E.H. Hiebert, and P.P. Afflerback (Eds.) *Authentic reading assessment: Practices and possibilities.* Newark, Deleware: International Reading Association.

Au, Kathryn Hu-pei. (1993). *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings.* Fort Worth, Texas: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Au, Kathryn Hu-pei. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly 11* (2) 91–115.

Au, Kathryn Hu-pei, Tharp, R.B., Crowell, D.C., Jordan, C., Speidel, G.E., and Calkins, R. (1984). KEEP: the role of research in the development of a successful reading program. In J. Osborn, P. Wilson, & R.C. Anderson (Eds.), *Reading educaton: Foundations for a literate America.* Boston: D.C. Heath.

Crowell, Doris. (1976). *The use of minimum objectives in curriculum research and development, 1975–76 (Technical Report No 45).* Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program.

Crowell, Doris. (1977). *Results of the minimum objective system, 1975-76 (Technical Report No.77).* Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program.

Erickson, F. and Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews.* New York: Academic Press.

Gallimore, Ronald, Boggs, Joan, and Jordan, Cathie. (1974). *Culture, behavior and education: A study of Hawaiian-Americans.* Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Gallimore, Ronald, et al. (1982). *Analysis of reading achievement test results for the Kamehameha Early Education Project: 1972–1979 (Technical Report No. 95).* Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program.

Hansen, J. (1992) Literacy portfolios: Helping students know themselves. *Educational Leadership (8),* 66–68.

John, Vera P. (1972) Styles of learning–styles of teaching: Reflections on the Education of Navajo Children. In Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John and Dell Hymes, eds. *Functions of Language in the Classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press. 331-343.

Jordan, Cathie. (1985). Translating culture: From ethnographic information to educational program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 16,* 105–123.

Keeton, William T. and Gould, James L. (1986). *Biological science.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

McCarty, Teresa L. (1993). Language, literacy, and the image of the child in American Indian classrooms. *Language Arts (70),* 182–192.

Moll, L., and Diaz, S. (1987). Change as the goal of educational research. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly. 18,* 300-311.

Sloat, Kim C. M., Tanaka-Matsumi, Junko, Ah Ho, Mele and Sueoka, Sarah. (1977). *Training teachers to use positive reinforcement through guided practice in the classroom. (Technical Report No. 68).* Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Kamehameha Early Education Program.

Sorenson, Marc. (1981). What are the basic skills? *Basic Skills Newsletter 1,2.* Rough Rock, Arizona: Rough Rock Demonstration School.

Tharp, Roland G. (1982). The effective instruction of comprehension: Results and description of the Kamehameha Early Education Program. *Reading Research Quarterly, (1),* 503–527.

Tharp, Roland G. et al. (1984). Product and process in applied developmental research: Educaton and the children of a minority. In M.E. Lamb, A.L. Brown, and B. Rogoff (Eds.), *Advances in developmental psychology,* Vol III. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Tharp, Roland G. and Gallimore, Ronald. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Vogt, Lynn, Jordan, C. and Tharp, R.G. (1993). Explaining school failure, producing school success: Two cases. In E. Jacob and C. Jordan (Eds.) *Minority education: Anthropological perspectives.* (pp. 53–65). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society.* M. Cole et al. (Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.